

Revised 2014 Educator Preparation Institution Performance Score



Joseph Martineau, Ph.D.
Deputy Superintendent of Accountability Services

Flora L. Jenkins, Ph.D., Director
Office of Professional Preparation Services

August 13, 2013



Why Revise the Score?

- Six years since the original score was implemented
- Reduce large scale changes of states caused by the current score
- Alignment to PK-12 Initiatives
- Focus on current priorities
- Considers feedback from stakeholders



Revision Process

- Formed a cross-office internal committee
- Reviewed informal feedback
- Considered current priorities
- Contacted individual stakeholders
- Invited public comment
- Conducted topical focus groups



Outlining the Score Components

- Three overarching goals

Goal 1: Ensure that the Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy

Goal 2: Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrate continuous improvement related to MDE specific priorities

Goal 3: Graduates meet standards for effectiveness



Five Data Sources to Triangulate Data

1. Registry of Educational Personnel (REP)
2. Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC)
3. Evidence Supported Annual Report (ESAR)
4. Survey Data
5. Michigan Online Educator Certification System (MOECS)



What do the data measure?

Registry of Education Personnel (REP)

- Teacher effectiveness ratings
- Program placement

Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification (MTTC)

- Subject area assessment results



What do the data measure (cont.)?

Evidence Supported Annual Report (ESAR)

- Annual measure to be used in-between the 2-7 year accreditation visits
- Opportunity for the Educator Preparation Institutions (EPI) to provide evidence, in a comprehensive manner, how it is meeting or exceeding the metrics identified by Michigan Department of Education (MDE)



What do the data measure (cont.)?

Evidence Supported Annual Report (ESAR) (cont.)

- Will be revised and resubmitted annually
- Responds to specific metrics identified by MDE
- Requires that all narrative be supported by evidence (data)



What do the data measure (cont.)?

Evidence Supported Annual Report (ESAR) (cont.)

- Will undergo a rigorous peer review and rating process
- Utilizes a point-based rating system that will be transparent to the EPIs
- Requires significant attention from the EPIs



What do the data measure (cont.)?

Surveys

- Expanded to include initial graduates and one year after graduation
- Teachers, supervising teachers, and principals
- Revised to align to the Michigan Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (MI-InTASC) standards



Goal 1

Ensure that the EPI has prepared candidates to be effective classroom teachers through exposure to content and pedagogy

Weighting: 50% of total score



Goal 1: Part A Factors

- A. Exposure to and demonstration of content knowledge and content specific pedagogy
 - 1. Content (MTTC)
 - 2. High-quality learning experiences (ESAR and Survey)



Goal 1: Part A Factors (continued)

3. Critical thinking (ESAR and Survey)
4. Connect real world problems and local and global issues (ESAR and Survey)



Goal 1: Part B Factors

B. Exposure to and demonstration of general pedagogical knowledge and skills

1. Technology (ESAR and Survey)

2. Special populations (ESAR and Survey)



Goal 1: Part B Factors (continued)

- 3. Learning environments (ESAR and Survey)
- 4. Effective use of data (ESAR and Survey)



Goal 2

Ensure that the EPI has the capacity to prepare teachers effectively and demonstrate continuous improvement related to MDE specific priorities

Weighting: 20% of total score



Goal 2 Factors

1. Candidate diversity – recruit, support and retain underrepresented students (ESAR)
2. Commitment to clinical preparation (ESAR and Survey)



Goal 2 Factors (continued)

3. State Evaluation System – flexible options in evaluation design (ESAR)
4. Placement rates in "shortage" areas – including support and advising of candidates in relation to “shortage” areas (REP, MOECS and ESAR)



Goal 3

Graduates meet standards for effectiveness

Weighting: 30% of total score



Goal 3 Factors

1. Ensure that candidates demonstrate effectiveness (REP and MOECS)
2. Placement Rates (REP, MOECS and ESAR)



Next Steps

- Finalization and dissemination of the 2014 EPI Performance Score weighting and metrics
- Technical assistance to institutions
- Implementation of the score elements
- Release of the 2014 EPI Performance Score using the new metrics in the Spring of 2014



Contact Information

For more information regarding the 2014 EPI
Performance Score, please contact:

Ms. Leah Breen, Assistant Director
Office of Professional Preparation Services
(517) 335-1151